

REMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION OF JULY 8, 2005

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner addressed claim limitations related to DirectDraw. Applicant respectfully notes that, contrary to what the Examiner seems to imply, the scope of the term "DirectDraw" is different from "a software for processing graphical information on a computer." For example, DirectDraw is COM based. *See, e.g., pages 24-26 of the specification.*

CLAIMS

Claims 25-37 were pending when last examined. Claims 1-24 were cancelled. With this Response, Applicant has amended Claims 25, 26, 28, 30-32, 34, 36, and 37. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 7A and 7B, and in the corresponding description in the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 25-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,313 to Salesky ("Salesky"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 25, as amended, recites a method that includes monitoring function calls made by a non-shared application to dynamically determine a position and a size of a window displayed in a presenter screen for the non-shared application; comparing positions and sizes of a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of a window for a shared application against the position and the size of the window for the non-shared application to determine any overlapping regions in the presenter screen; capturing a screen shot of an image corresponding to the non-DirectDraw and the DirectDraw regions of the window for the shared application; and transmitting the screen shot and information for the position and size of the overlapping regions to generate a viewer screen.

In contrast, Salesky fails to disclose determining a position and a size of a window displayed in a presenter screen for a non-shared application and comparing positions and sizes of a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of a window for a shared application against the position and the size of the window for the non-shared application to determine any overlapping regions in the presenter screen.

Although Salesky discloses a capture rectangle 51 on a presenter client screen 55 (FIG. 6B), it fails to disclose a window displayed in the presenter screen for a non-shared application. Salesky also fails to disclose a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of a window for a shared application. Lacking the non-DirectDraw and DirectDraw regions and the window for the non-shared application, Salesky cannot disclose comparing positions and sizes of the non-DirectDraw region and the DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application against the position and the size of the window for the non-shared application to determine any overlapping regions in the presenter screen. Thus, Salesky fails to disclose at least the above limitations of the claim, and claim 25 should be allowed.

Independent claims 31 and 37 include limitations that are similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 25. Because Salesky fails to disclose at least these limitations, claims 31 and 37 are allowable.

Claims 26-30 and 32-36 are dependent claims that should be allowed for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-1200.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.

EV 611 224 875 US

Respectfully submitted,



By: Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

July 29, 2005
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715